

HONEY CREEK TMDL
SUMMARY OF COMMENTS AND RESPONSES
Prepared by the Environmental Protection Agency, Region 7
Water, Wetlands, and Pesticides Division
August, 2006

COMMENTOR(S):

- Anne Peery, TMDL Developer, Missouri Department of Natural Resources (MDNR) (via email)
- David Cavender, 1507 East Price Street, Springfield, Missouri 65804 (via email)

INTRODUCTION

This document summarizes the submitted comment(s), identifies the commenter(s), responds to the comment(s), and summarizes change(s) made to the final TMDL. They are arranged by TMDL section wherever possible. Any change that is made to the TMDL in response to comment(s) is summarized in the response. If no change is noted in the response, then no change was needed in the TMDL.

SUMMARY OF CHANGES TO THE FINAL TMDL

The monitoring section and Appendix B have been updated with more recent data from MDNR. Appendix D has been edited to make it more readable.

COMMENTS AND RESPONSES

GENERAL COMMENTS

Comment 1: David Cavender writes that there is a lack of data on aquatic life in Honey Creek and that biological data is needed to determine if the stream should remain on the Missouri list of impaired waters.

Response: This comment is beyond the scope of the TMDL public notice which does not deal with the listing methodology for sulfate in Missouri. Honey Creek was judged to be impaired based on numeric criteria for sulfate which the TMDL utilizes to analyze and address the impaired waterbody.

Comment 2: Anne Peery suggests that we add "draft" watermarks to our TMDLs on Public Notice.

Response: All of our TMDLs on Public Notice will now include a "draft" watermark.

SECTION 1: INTRODUCTION

No Comments

SECTION 2: BACKGROUND AND WATER QUALITY PROBLEMS

No Comments

SECTION 3: DESCRIPTION OF THE APPLICABLE WQS AND NUMERIC WATER QUALITY TARGETS

No Comments

SECTION 4: CALCULATION OF LOAD CAPACITY

No Comments

SECTION 5: LOAD ALLOCATION (NONPOINT SOURCE LOADS)

No Comments

SECTION 6: MARGIN OF SAFETY

No Comments

SECTION 7: SEASONAL VARIATION

No Comments

SECTION 8: MONITORING PLANS FOR HONEY CREEK

Comment 1: Anne Peery suggests that we use data that she provides to update MDNR's data on current conditions of Honey Creek.

Response: The monitoring section and Appendix B have been updated with your more recent data.

SECTION 9: PUBLIC PARTICIPATION

No Comments

SECTION 10: APPENDICES

Comment 1: Anne Peery suggests that we use data that she provides to update MDNR's data on current conditions of Honey Creek.

Response: The monitoring section and Appendix B have been updated with more recent data.

Comment 2: Anne Peery suggests that we edit Appendix D to make it more readable.

Response: Appendix D has gone through several edits to make it more readable.